

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 35759

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 550
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: July 24, 2009
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DANE K. ALEXANDER,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. Charles W. Hosack, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of four years, with one and one-half years determinate, for possession of methamphetamine and accessory by concealing or harboring a felon, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge, PERRY, Judge
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Dane K. Alexander was convicted of possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(C)(1), and accessory by concealing or harboring a felon, I.C. § 18-205. The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of four years, with one and one-half years determinate and retained jurisdiction. Upon completion of retained jurisdiction, Alexander was placed on probation for two years. Alexander appeals, contending that the sentences are excessive.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Alexander's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.